

1                                   **THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC LIBRARY**  
2                                   **CONSTRUCTION AND RENOVATION BOARD MINUTES**

3  
4                                   **Department of Water Resources**  
5                                   **1416 Ninth Street**  
6                                   **First Floor Lobby Auditorium**  
7                                   **Sacramento, California 95814**  
8                                   **December 19, 2002**  
9

10  
11                   **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

12                   Dr. Kevin Starr, State Librarian of California, convened the meeting on at 1:13  
13 p.m. The following Board members were present:

14                   Senator Dede Alpert; Treasurer Philip Angelides; Assemblymember Ellen  
15 Corbett; Barton "Bart" P. Pachino, Esq.; and Ms. Annette Porini, representing the  
16 Director of Finance.

17                   Before beginning the business portion of the meeting, Dr. Starr recognized Board  
18 Member Ellen Corbett, who introduced elected officials in the audience:  
19 Assemblymember Lois Wolk, representing Solano County and Yolo County, and  
20 Assemblymember Doug La Malfa, representing Shasta County and eight other counties  
21 to the north. Dr. Starr welcomed the elected officials present.

22                   Dr. Starr stated the purpose of the meeting was to consider awarding  
23 approximately \$19,600,000 of the remaining first cycle Library Bond Act grant funds.

24                   **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

25                   **Ms. Corbett moved that the California Public Library Construction and**  
26                   **Renovation Board adopt the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.**

27                   **APPROVAL OF December 2, 2002, BOARD MEETING MINUTES**

28                   It was moved and seconded (Pachino/Porini), that the California Public  
29 Library Construction and Renovation Board approve the minutes of the December 2,  
30 2002, meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

1 **OVERVIEW OF THE STAFF REVIEW OF FIRST CYCLE LIBRARY BOND ACT**  
2 **APPLICATIONS**  
3

4 In beginning the consideration of grant awards for the remaining first cycle grant  
5 funds, Dr. Starr noted that at the December 2, 2002, meeting, the Board passed a  
6 motion asking the State Librarian to make recommendations at the beginning of this  
7 meeting.

8 Dr. Starr presented three recommendations for award from the remaining first  
9 cycle funds. These recommendations would leave a balance of \$89,000. Dr. Starr  
10 indicated that funding as many projects as possible would assist in stimulating local  
11 economies and enable projects that are waiting to move forward to do so.

12 His first recommendation was the Shasta County/Redding project, which is  
13 located in a city but is serving a large rural area. Among its strong points, this project  
14 has extraordinary popular support, with much of its funding coming from small donations  
15 by residents. He noted that it fulfills many expectations for smart growth in terms of its  
16 relationship to other public buildings and its accessibility to public transportation and  
17 that it is a first priority project that received a high rating. Funding this project would  
18 demonstrate that grant funding is intended for the entire state. He indicated that it  
19 would be difficult to foresee future applications coming from the north of this magnitude  
20 or importance. He emphasized his personal sense as a historian of the importance of  
21 the residents of the upstate region as guardians of our natural resources and that as  
22 State Librarian he recognizes that the project would have strong impact throughout  
23 Shasta County as well as Eureka, Yreka, and the adjacent counties. Dr. Starr indicated  
24 his strong commitment that library service be equal throughout the state, as much as  
25 possible, and that there be no second-class library citizens.

1 Dr. Starr's second recommendation for funding consideration was the Logan  
2 Heights Branch project from the City of San Diego, at the opposite end of the state. He  
3 noted as a point of information that it is not within the district of any of the elected Board  
4 members. He noted that it is a community heavily comprised of immigrants who are  
5 striving to obtain higher educational and skills levels and who need the library in these  
6 efforts. Dr. Starr pointed out that the library is currently housed in a 1920's antiquated  
7 and inadequate building, and noted that, as with the Shasta County/Redding project,  
8 funding this project would reach out to another particular community with a first-rate  
9 project.

10 Dr. Starr's third recommendation for funding consideration was the Excelsior  
11 Branch Library renovation in the outer Mission District of San Francisco. The  
12 community is comprised of immigrants from many countries, making it similar to the  
13 Logan Heights Branch Library project, and has a high rating. He noted that the branch  
14 is located in a predominately blue-collar neighborhood where the residents are  
15 especially interested in computer skills but where public access to computers is very  
16 challenging for the majority of the residents, especially those in the immigrant group.  
17 The library will be important to the residents for the development of computer skills,  
18 which would enhance employment possibilities.

19 Dr. Starr noted the difficulty of determining recommendations among the  
20 remaining applications. He then turned the meeting over to the Board members for  
21 discussion.

22 Following a brief discussion by Board Members Starr, Corbett, and Angelides  
23 concerning whether to hear public comment before considering additional alternatives, it  
24 was decided to reserve further Board remarks until after public comments were heard.

1 Dr. Starr then moved to public testimony, and the following speakers were heard.

2 *[A transcript of the full speaker comments is available on the Office of Library*

3 *Construction Web site: [www.olc.library.ca.gov](http://www.olc.library.ca.gov)]*

4 • Diane Duquette, Director of Kern County Library, spoke on behalf of

5 Frazier Park Branch Library project

6 • Harry Price, Vice Mayor for the City of Fairfield, spoke on behalf of the

7 Fairfield/Cordelia Library project

8 • James Buckley, City Librarian of Torrance, spoke on behalf of the North

9 Torrance Library project.

10 • James Bozajian, Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Calabasas, spoke on

11 behalf of the Calabasas Library project.

12 • Donald Zimring, Deputy Superintendent of Schools to the Las Virgenes

13 School District, spoke on behalf of the Calabasas Library project.

14 • Fred Gaines, Calabasas Library Commission member, spoke on behalf of

15 the Calabasas Public Library project.

16

17 Pausing in public comments, Dr. Starr recognized Treasurer Angelides who

18 directed questions to staff in order to clarify the issues related to first and second priority

19 applications for new libraries. *[Under discussion was the fact that the Calabasas*

20 *application was for a second priority new public library. There are currently cooperative*

21 *endeavors between the library and the school district, but a joint use agreement was not*

22 *submitted with the application, making it a second priority project.]* Mr. Angelides asked

23 staff to clarify if the Bond Act regulations require a joint use agreement for first priority

24 applications. Ms. Springer, Deputy Library Bond Act Manager, replied that the Bond Act

25 specifies it. Mr. Hall, Library Bond Act Manager, read from the Bond Act: "First priority

26 shall be given to joint-use projects in which the agency that operates the library and one

27 or more school districts have a cooperative agreement."

1           Treasurer Angelides asked how the “Cooperative Agreement” is delineated in the  
2 regulations. Mr. Hall indicated that the requirements for a joint use cooperative  
3 agreement are delineated in an appendix in the regulations and that the agreement is  
4 required to be submitted with the application.

5           Treasurer Angelides indicated that his wish was to clarify if the regulations  
6 specify a formal agreement and noted that a having a first priority designation does not  
7 dictate inclusion or exclusion of an application for funding and that the Board still had a  
8 policy choice available to them. Mr. Angelides asked staff to read the specific  
9 regulation. Mr. Hall read: “As required in Section 20440 (d) (1), applicants with joint use  
10 projects shall submit a copy of the cooperative agreement between the public library  
11 and the school districts, that includes the following elements...” Mr. Hall indicated that  
12 the section specifies the required elements.

13           Mr. Angelides stated that he respected that the supporters view the Calabasas  
14 project as a fundable project, but that it would be very difficult to waive the regulatory  
15 requirement, and the absence of a formal cooperative agreement was something within  
16 the city’s control to remedy. Mr. Angelides pointed out that a 20-year commitment to  
17 provide the stipulated services is substantive and that while the service may be present,  
18 without a contractual relationship, the 20-year commitment does not exist. Mr.  
19 Angelides pointed out that this was a situation that could be remedied for the second  
20 cycle.

21           Mr. Pachino stated that it is within the Board’s power to award grants to second-  
22 priority projects and that they awarded grants to two second-priority projects at the  
23 previous meeting, albeit for different purposes.

24           Public comments resumed:

- 25           • *[Continuation]* Fred Gaines, Calabasas Library Commission member

- Charlotte Meyer, Chair of the Education Commission, City of Calabasas, spoke on behalf of the Calabasas Library project.
- Donna Reed, Chairman of the San Leandro Library Commission, spoke on behalf of the Manor Community Branch Library Project.
- Robert Hammond, Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Monrovia, spoke on behalf of the Monrovia Library Project.
- Denise Zoolalian, Monrovia Public Library Board President, spoke on behalf of the Monrovia Library Project.
- B.J. Hill spoke on behalf of the Julian Joint Venture Public Library project.
- Mark Cibula, Mayor for the City of Redding, spoke on behalf of the Shasta County/Redding Library project.
- Irwin Fust, Shasta County Board of Supervisors member, spoke on behalf of the Shasta County/Redding Library project.
- David Kehoe, Shasta County Board of Supervisors Chairman, spoke on behalf of the Shasta County/Redding Library project.
- Missy McArthur Emmerson spoke on behalf of the Shasta County/Redding Library project.
- Doug La Malfa, California Assembly Member, Second District, spoke on behalf of the Shasta County/Redding Library project.
- Cyr Miller, San Rafael City Council Member, spoke on behalf of the Pickleweed Library project.
- Bill Sannwald, Assistant to the San Diego City Manager, spoke on behalf of two projects: the Logan Heights Branch Library project and the La Mesa Branch Library project.
- Ron Roberts, Mayor for the City of Temecula, spoke on behalf of the Temecula Library Project.
- Barbara Tooker, Temecula Valley Unified School District outgoing president, spoke on behalf of the Temecula Library project.

1 Pausing the public comments, Dr. Starr recognized Senator Dede Alpert who  
2 stated that she and Assemblywoman Corbett would be introducing a library bond  
3 measure so that, after the second and third funding rounds of the current Library Bond  
4 Act, there would be additional rounds to assist public libraries throughout California.

5 Public comments resumed:

- 6 • Thomas Clabby, Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Lemon Grove, spoke on  
7 behalf of the Lemon Grove Library project.
- 8 • Rosemary Putnam spoke on behalf of the Lemon Grove Library project.
- 9 • Linda Wood, Alameda County Librarian, spoke on behalf of the Castro  
10 Valley Library project.
- 11 • Susan Hildreth, San Francisco Public Library City Librarian, spoke on  
12 behalf of the Excelsior Branch Library project.
- 13 • Richard King, consultant, spoke on behalf of funding library projects in  
14 smaller communities in general
- 15 • Marilyn Crouch, San Diego County Library Director, spoke on behalf of  
16 Julian Branch Library project.
- 17 • Lois Wolk, Assemblywoman, Eighth Assembly District (Solano County),  
18 spoke on behalf of the Fairfield/Cordelia Library Project.
- 19 • Steve Lantsberger, City of Hesperia staff member, spoke on behalf of the  
20 Hesperia Branch Library project.

21  
22 Having heard all comments from the public, at 3:06 p.m. Dr. Starr called for a  
23 brief recess, and the meeting reconvened at 3:19 p.m.

24 Dr. Starr stated the first order of business was to address Mr. Pachino's desire  
25 for a policy discussion regarding the Calabasas issue. Mr. Pachino stated he felt the  
26 points had been adequately addressed but would like to bring the Calabasas project  
27 forward for approval or disapproval.

1           ***It was moved (Pachino) that the California Public Library Construction***  
2           ***and Renovation Board approve the Calabasas project. Motion died for***  
3           ***lack of a second.***  
4

5           ***It was moved and seconded, (Starr/Porini) that the California Public***  
6           ***Library Construction and Renovation Board fund the Shasta***  
7           ***County/Redding Main Library; the Logan Heights Branch Library, the***  
8           ***City of San Diego; the Excelsior Branch Library renovation of the City***  
9           ***and County of San Francisco; and return the remaining \$89,000 to the***  
10          ***third sequence.***  
11

12           Beginning the discussion of the motion, Ms. Porini indicated that, even though  
13 she didn't feel there were enough votes for the Shasta County/Redding project, she felt  
14 strongly about a balance within the state, strongly supported it, and hoped that it would  
15 return in the second grant application round. Mr. Angelides stated his high regard for  
16 the Shasta County/Redding project. He indicated that it is an area that will experience  
17 significant growth in the future; that it faces tremendous economic challenges; that it  
18 has significant potential for the state. He said that it is a very worthy project but  
19 questioned whether it could be funded at this time in light of the competing demands for  
20 the remaining funds. He voiced agreement the project is an excellent one and that,  
21 while there could be no pre-commitment, it should be funded at some point in the  
22 funding rounds. Mr. Angelides pointed out that the next application round is due in  
23 March and that the construction start date for the Shasta County/Redding application is  
24 slated for Spring 2004. While not committing to the future, he stated that, based on  
25 other Board members comments regarding the project, it should do very well.

26           Mr. Angelides indicated a desire to make some comments and to hear those of  
27 other Board members before taking Dr. Starr's motion or entertaining a substitute  
28 motion. He presented a map he had prepared with pins placed to indicate which  
29 libraries had been funded to date, as well as his suggestions regarding what he felt  
30 might be worthy additions for funding. In making the recommendations, he indicated



1 that he took into account several things: staff ratings and written comments; how best  
2 to meet the needs of the state for libraries within the context of what is supported by the  
3 statute; and some semblance of geographic balance, recognizing there are two grant  
4 cycles remaining. He indicated that it is incumbent upon the Board to meet the urban  
5 and rural need of the state by the time the third cycle is completed.

6 Mr. Angelides prefaced his funding recommendations by indicating that his desire  
7 is to fund projects that meet as many needs as possible with the remaining  
8 \$19,000,000. Mr. Angelides first recommendation for funding was the Visalia Library  
9 renovation, a "re-use" project located within the historic downtown. He stated his view  
10 that renovation projects have a different kind of "Priority 1/Priority 2" test because they  
11 are not in the same kind of control due to the inclusion of school conditions, and the  
12 standards are different than for projects for new libraries. He pointed out that there had  
13 been no other projects funded to date in the Central Valley region.

14 Mr. Angelides next recommendations were the Manor Community Branch, the  
15 Lemon Grove project, and the Logan Heights project. He pointed out that these  
16 projects add to the geographic representation and are located in communities that have  
17 economic challenges, diversity of challenges and opportunities, and provide geographic  
18 representation, as well as reinforcement of existing neighborhoods. Mr. Angelides final  
19 recommendation for funding, in order to add a rural project, was the Julian Branch  
20 Library project. He mentioned that, while some who live in urban areas would view  
21 Visalia as a rural area, it is now a community of over 100,000.

22 After clarifying the mechanics of how to handle the motions under consideration  
23 and that the recommended projects fit within the available funding amount, the Board  
24 continued its discussion. Senator Alpert commented on the difficulty of the decision and  
25 said that she was compelled to fund as many projects as possible due to the small

1 amount of money remaining. She agreed that the Treasurer's recommendations would  
2 provide a good balance for the first grant round.

3 Assemblymember Corbett expressed thanks to those who spoke during the  
4 public comment period, giving the Board, as well as the others present, the benefit of  
5 hearing about their individual circumstances. She expressed concern about fairness  
6 and regional disbursement of funding. She said that, even though it is not a part of the  
7 Bond Act, it is within the realm of the Board to consider the voters of the entire state  
8 who supported the measure. She stated she was willing to support the Treasurer's  
9 proposal because it reflects a fair balance in the state and indicated the Board would  
10 have an opportunity to work on other issues in future funding cycles. She encouraged  
11 those who would not receive funding to apply in future grant cycles.

12 Mr. Pachino stated he would propose a different group of projects for  
13 consideration. He recommended funding the Temecula project and briefly discussed  
14 the issue regarding the debate as to whether there is an existing library in the  
15 community. He also recommended the Visalia project, the Manor project, and the  
16 Fairfield project. He expressed disagreement with the grouping recommended by Mr.  
17 Angelides, but indicated it was close to the type of recommendations he would make.  
18 He said he would prefer to add the Temecula project.

19 Ms. Porini recommended calling for a vote on the motion before the Board.

20 Before calling for the vote, Dr. Starr granted himself privilege as Chair to speak  
21 on behalf of the three projects he recommended for funding. He noted that Shasta  
22 County/Redding project is crucial to the emerging metropolis that is a city as well as a  
23 service area for a large rural area, and mentioned the importance of upstate California.  
24 Dr. Starr noted that the Logan Heights project represents emergent California, new  
25 Californians who are honing their skills and who want into the California dream. He

1 stated his support for the Excelsior Branch for the same reasons and for its service  
2 people who keep San Francisco running.

3 Dr. Starr called for the question.

4 **Ayes (Starr/Porini). Nays (None). Motion failed for lack of sufficient**  
5 **votes.**

6 Dr. Starr asked Mr. Pachino if he desired to pursue funding of the Temecula  
7 project on a solitary basis or if he wanted to pursue it in dialog with other motions. Mr.  
8 Pachino suggested taking a vote on Mr. Angelides motion before considering any other  
9 recommendations.

10 Mr. Angelides indicated his strong feelings about the Shasta County/Redding  
11 project and that he was trying to blend his policy concerns with what could be  
12 accomplished at the current meeting with the available funds for this cycle. He also  
13 indicated that he felt the Board should be attentive to geographic balance in the next  
14 two rounds of funding.

15 **It was moved and seconded (Angelides/Alpert) that the California Public**  
16 **Library Construction and Renovation Board approve the following projects:**  
17 **the Visalia renovation, the Manor Community Branch project, the Lemon**  
18 **Grove Community project, the Logan Heights project, and the Julian**  
19 **project, and the balance be carried over.**  
20

21 Ms. Porini asked for the total dollar amount for the projects under consideration.

22 Mr. Hall indicated that the total dollar amount, including the projects under consideration  
23 and the previously funded projects, was \$149,226,329. This left \$773,671 remaining  
24 from this funding cycle, which would be carried over to the final funding cycle. Dr. Starr  
25 asked about the grant amount needed for the Pickleweed project, and Mr. Hall indicated  
26 that it was approximately \$1.2 million, which exceeds the amount remaining. The  
27 Trinidad project was mentioned, and it was noted that the application had been

1 withdrawn. Mr. Pachino asked that the amount of funds available for grant award be  
2 clarified, and Mr. Hall replied that it is approximately \$19.68 million.

3 Dr. Starr noted that Mr. Angelides, in making his motion, acknowledged very  
4 strongly the question of geographical balance, and he said that it is an important point to  
5 keep in mind for the second and third cycles.

6 Mr. Pachino proposed four projects for funding: Fairfield, Temecula, Frazier Park  
7 and the Manor project, which he indicated would make the total dollar amount  
8 \$19,655,632, with about \$25,000 remaining. He pointed out that this would meet the  
9 goals of regional, rural, north/south, emerging growth areas distribution, as well as  
10 funding a Central Valley project (Fairfield).

11 Ms. Porini called for the question on Mr. Angelides original motion. Dr. Starr  
12 repeated that the motion was to fund Visalia, Manor, Lemon Grove, and the Julian  
13 Heights projects.

14 ***There was one “nay” vote (Pachino). The motion carried.***

15 Mr. Pachino announced that he wished to change is “nay” vote to make the  
16 motion carry unanimously.

17 **Adjournment**

18 After asking for final Board comments and hearing none, Dr. Starr congratulated the  
19 grant recipients. Dr. Starr called for a motion to adjourn, which was made by Mr.  
20 Angelides and carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

21 Respectfully submitted,

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 Linda Springer, Deputy Library Bond Act Manager

24  
25 Dated: October 28, 2003

26 Adopted: October 28, 2003